

Dariusz R. PIWOWARCZYK
Jagiellonian University in Kraków

THE MAGNIFICENT FIVE – THE LATIN FIFTH DECLENSION REVISITED

The present article presents the current status of research on the origin of the Latin fifth declension with the discussion of the core forms of this type of inflection and their origin (*diēs* 'day', *rēs* 'thing', *spēs* 'hope', *fidēs* 'faith', *plēbēs* 'people'). It is claimed that in all of these forms the *-ēs* inflection is acquired secondarily and thus should not be transposed back to the Indo-European proto-language, contrary to some of the theories which trace the origin of the Latin fifth declension back to the **-ē* (**-eh₁*) stems of Proto-Indo-European. The Latin words of *diēs* 'day' and *rēs* 'thing' belong to the most frequently occurring vocabulary in the language and therefore could have been used as models of analogical reshaping.

Latin, fifth declension, historical linguistics

Professor Marek Stachowski has great achievements in the field of etymology both as the author of numerous works on the topic, a gifted lecturer and as the creator and editor of a linguistic journal dedicated completely to the research in this domain. In this article I wish to present the current problems concerning the origin of the core nouns of the Latin fifth declension which I hope He as the Honoree of the volume will find interesting.

1. Latin is noted for having a peculiar type of inflection which does not seem to have any comparative evidence elsewhere in Indo-European and appears to be an inner-Latin creation (the situation in Sabellic is not clear, cf. Weiss 2009: 254) – the so-called fifth declension (cf. Pedersen 1926; Leumann 1977: 285,

444–447; Klingenschmitt 1992: 127–135; Meiser 1998: 147–149). The origin of this *ē*-stem inflection has been under discussion ever since the earliest times of comparative linguistics. Already the earliest scholars in the field, Rask, Bopp and Schleicher, pointed out the existence of this type of inflection and claimed that it was secondary (their views are summarized by Pedersen 1926: 3–7). Brugmann (1886: 338ff) compared the Latin fifth declension with the Baltic *ē*-stems and on this basis assumed the existence of **-ē*-stems in the proto-language. Sommer (1914) demonstrated that most, if not all, Baltic *ē*-stems go back to the **-iġā*-proto-form thus having nothing in common with the Latin *ē*-stems. His view was in turn criticized by Pedersen (1926), who tried to show that the **-ē*-stems existed in the proto-language. The view of Pedersen was taken up by Beekes (1985: 37–38), Schrijver (1991: 379–387) and Kortlandt (1997) who all assume the existence of an **-eh₁*-inflection in Proto-Indo-European. Other scholars explain the peculiar Latin *ē*-stems as going back originally to various formations in the proto-language which ended up eventually in Latin as *ē*-stems (cf. Meiser 1998: 147–149; Weiss 2009: 254; Klingenschmitt 1992: 127–135).

2. The prime example of a noun belonging to this type of declension is the hysterokinetic *u*-stem *diēs* ‘day’ (cf. WH 1: 349–351; EM: 311–313; Leumann 1977: 356–358; Weiss 2009: 254; Nussbaum 1999; Rau 2010):

	PIE	Vedic	Greek	Italic reflexes
Nom. sg.	<i>*d(i)j-éu-s</i>	<i>d(i)yáuh</i>	<i>Zeús</i>	L. <i>diūs/diēs</i> , <i>Diēspiter</i> (after <i>*diēm</i>)
Gen. sg.	<i>*di-u-é/ós</i>	<i>diváh</i>	<i>Diós</i>	L. <i>dius</i> ‘by day’
Dat. sg.	<i>*di-u-éj</i>	<i>divé</i>	<i>Diuei-</i>	L. <i>DIVEI-</i>
Acc. sg.	<i>*d(i)j-éu-m</i>	<i>d(i)yám</i>	<i>Zēn</i>	L. <i>diem</i> , U. <i>dei</i>
Loc. sg.	<i>*d(i)j-éu-Ø</i>	<i>dyávi</i>	<i>diū</i> ‘day by day’	
Voc. sg.	<i>*d(i)j-éu-Ø</i>	<i>dyáuh</i>	<i>Zeū</i>	<i>lū(piter)</i> , U. <i>Iupater</i> / U. <i>di</i>

3. In the earlier scholarship this noun was mostly classified as a root noun (cf. Schindler 1973; Fortson 2010: 116) but Rau (2010) has recently shown that it was a hysterokinetic *u*-stem. The form could be mono- and disyllabic in the proto-language by Lindeman’s Law, according to which monosyllabic words can scan disyllabically following a word ending in a heavy syllable (cf. Fortson 2010: 72; Schindler 1977). Different scansions survive in Italic and especially in

Vedic, where both the monosyllabic (*dyáuḥ*) and disyllabic (*diyáuḥ*) versions are found in meter (cf. Mayrhofer 1963: 70). The accusative singular **dī-eu-m* developed to **dīēm* by Stang's Law (Stang 1965) already in PIE and was inherited in Proto-Italic as **dīiēm* (in its Lindeman variant, cf. Weiss 2009: 248 [but see also de Vaan 2008: 170 for an alternative solution – introduction of the **di-* from the oblique cases]). In Latin the nominative was analogically extended to the accusative as **dīiēs* before the shortening of vowels in front of **-m* (cf. Weiss 2009: 254). The model for such a creation was probably the pattern of the other nouns with the acc. *-Vm*: nom. *-Vs* and the word *rēs* 'thing', on which see below. The other reflexes of the **d(i)i-éu-s* paradigm are less clear. As noticed by Nussbaum (1999) the stem **dīeu-* had a threefold reflex in Italic: the noun meaning 'day', another noun meaning 'Jupiter' and several adverb formations. It is also the basis for the *vrddhi* derivative **deiuós* eventually giving *deus* in Latin (cf. Weiss 2009: 225). The original nominative of **dīieus*¹ is most probably preserved in the phrase *Dius Fidius* 'Jupiter of oaths' and the phrase *nudius tertius* 'the day before yesterday' but the expected long **ū* cannot be confirmed (cf. Weiss 2009: 248). The genitive is probably reflected in the adverb *dius* 'by day' and the locative in the adverb *diū* 'by day, for a long time' (cf. de Vaan 2008: 172–173). The dative might be preserved in an inscription as *DIVEI* (cf. Weiss 2009: 248). The vocative was used in the phrase **dīeu ph₂ter* which has comparanda elsewhere in Indo-European (Greek *Zeū páter*, Vedic *dyāuṣ pitāḥ*, cf. Mayrhofer 1963: 70) and thus became *Iūpiter* and later *Iuppiter* 'Jupiter'. The accusative **dīiēm* is also preserved in Umbrian *dei*. The other Umbrian form, *di* (and also written twice as *dei*) is probably a vocative and an innovation on the basis of **dīiēm* as it comes back to the form **dīiē* which is not the inherited vocative and does not appear in Latin (cf. Buck 1904: 131). This stem is also present in the Oscan derivative *zicolom* < **dīē-kelo* (Untermann 2000: 868, cf. de Vaan 2008: 170). Latin and Sabellic has then further split the paradigm and created a new one – with **dīou-* as the basis (cf. the gen. sg. Latin *Iovis*, Oscan *Iúveis* etc.). Where exactly this new stem originated is not completely clear. Meiser (1998: 144) and de Vaan (2008: 315–316) assume that the

- 1 It has been assumed that the nominative should be reconstructed with a lengthened grade for PIE on the basis of the Vedic form *dyāuṣ* and subsequently shortened in Greek and Italic by Osthoff's law. However, already de Saussure (1879: 185) demonstrated that this form could be analogical and thus the Greek (and Latin) forms with normal *e*-grade as expected in an hysterokinetic **u*-stem could be original (cf. also Szemerényi 1956: 186f.; Watkins 1974: 103).

acc. sg. was restored as **d̥iou-em* and that the other forms were based on that one following the additional influence of the archaic vocative: Latin *Iūpiter*, Umbrian *Iupater*. On the other hand, Nussbaum (1999) thinks that the acc. **d̥iou-em* may also be an innovation since the inherited form is **d̥iēm* (an assumption supported by Umbrian *dei*, Latin *diem*). He also claims that neither the inherited nominative **d̥ious* nor the vocative **d̥iou* could be good sources of this new stem since the nominative is preserved in *dius* and *Diespiter* (*diēs* made to **diēm*) and the vocative could only become the source when the unverbated **ioupater* was turned into nominative. Instead, he assumes that the inherited locative **d̥iou-i* (as in Latin abl. *Iove*) was the basis for the new stem **d̥iou-*. That direction is also indicated by the existence of the Lindeman variant of the endingless locative **d(i)̥iou* as perhaps attested in the Oscan form *Diúvei*. Walde-Hoffmann (WH 1: 350) look for the basis of the **d̥iou-* stem in the ablative (locative) **d̥iou-i* (Latin *Iove*) and the vocative (Latin *Iūpiter*, Umbrian *Iupater*). The Italic paradigm of the noun in the meaning 'Jupiter' was probably the following (after Nussbaum 1999):

Nom. sg.	<i>*d̥iēs</i>	(Latin <i>Diespiter</i>)		
Acc. sg.	<i>*d̥iēm</i>	(Umbrian <i>dei</i>)	<i>*d̥iou-em</i>	(L. <i>DIOVEM</i> , <i>Iovem</i>)
Voc. sg.	<i>*d̥iē</i>	(Umbrian <i>dī</i>)	<i>*d̥iou</i>	(L. <i>Iūpiter</i> , U. <i>Iupater</i>)
Gen. sg.			<i>*d̥iou-es</i>	(L. <i>DIOVOS</i> , <i>Iovis</i> , O. <i>Iúveis</i>)
Dat. sg.			<i>*d(i)̥iou-ei</i>	(L. <i>DIOVE</i> , <i>Iovī</i> , O. <i>Iuvei</i> / <i>Diúvei</i>)
Loc. sg.			<i>*d̥iou-i</i>	(L. <i>Iove</i>)

The relative chronology of the development of the noun **d̥ieu-* in Proto-Italic seems to have been as follows:

	PIE	'skygod'	'sky(god), day'	'Jupiter'
Nom. sg.	<i>*d(i)̥-éu-s</i>	<i>*d̥ious</i>	<i>*d̥iēs</i>	– ∞ <i>*i̥ou-pater</i>
Gen. sg.	<i>*di-u-é/ós</i>	<i>*d̥i̯uos</i>	↑	<i>*d̥iou-es</i>
Dat. sg.	<i>*di-u-éi</i>	<i>*d̥i̯uei</i>		<i>*d̥iou-ei</i>
Acc. sg.	<i>*d(i)̥-éu-m̥</i>	<i>*d̥iēm</i>	→	<i>*d̥iou-em</i>
Loc. sg.	<i>*d(i)̥-éu-Ø</i>	<i>*d̥iou</i>	→	<i>*d̥iou-i</i>
Voc. sg.	<i>*d(i)̥-éu-Ø</i>	<i>*d̥iou</i>	>	<i>*d̥iou-pater</i>

+ in U.
new voc. **d̥iē*

The preservation of *di-* in forms of the type *dīus* can be due to the Lindeman variant of the form **dīious* (cf. Weiss 2009: 248) or due to the introduction of the *di-* from the oblique cases (cf. de Vaan 2008: 170). Otherwise the form **dī-* would have been turned into **ī-* as in **dīou > lū-*.

4. Alongside the word for ‘day’ we also find other common words in this declension. One of these is *rēs* ‘thing, matter’, which might be either an *i*-stem **(h_x)reh₁-i-s*, cognate with Vedic acc. sg. *rayīm* (cf. Weiss 2009: 248; Meiser 1998: 148; WH 2: 430–431; EM: 1008–1009; Mayrhofer 1976: 45–46) or a root noun **(h_x)reh₁-*, as witnessed by the Vedic form *rām* ‘gift’ to the root *rā-* ‘give’ (cf. Schindler 1972: 41, following personal communication with Karl Hoffmann). It is impossible to tell which one was inherited in Latin as both the *i*-stem and the root noun would eventually surface the same (cf. de Vaan 2008: 520–521; Szemerényi 1956).

5. Schindler (1972: 41) observed that the Vedic forms acc.sg. *rām* and acc.pl. *rāḥ*, normally connected with the root *rayí-*, *rāy-* ‘wealth’ can be connected with a root *rā-* ‘give’. Following a personal comment from Karl Hoffmann, Schindler assumes the existence of a root noun *rā-* ‘gift’. It is attested in the following Vedic fragment (RV 10.111.7):

sácanta yád uśásah sūryena
citrām asya ketávo rām avindan

‘Als die Morgenroten mit dem Sonnengott zusammentraten, fanden seine Strahlen die herrliche Gabe’ (cf. Schindler 1972: 41).

‘When the Dawns come attendant upon Sūrya their rays discover wealth of divers colours.’ (translation by Ralph Griffith, cf. Griffith 1897: 555).

‘Als sich die Uśas’ mit dem Sonnengotte zusammentaten, da fanden dessen Strahlen den wunderbaren Reichtum.’ (translation by Karl Geldner, cf. Geldner 1951: 334).

‘When the Dawns kept company with the Sun, their beacons found his glittering gift’ (translation by Joel Brereton and Stephanie Jamison, cf. Brereton, Jamison 2014: 1578).

A somewhat similar assumption has been taken up by Beekes (1985: 80–81) who also assumes the existence of a root noun **HreH-* but considers the Vedic forms acc.sg. *rām* and acc.pl. *rāḥ* as older forms of the root which shows up in Vedic as *rayí-*, *rāy-* ‘wealth’. He reconstructs the following paradigm for the proto-language (Beekes 1985: 80–81):

	PIE		Proto-Indo-Iranian		Proto-Indo-Aryan
Nom. sg.	* <i>Her-H-s</i>	>	* <i>Har-i-s</i>	>	* <i>raH-i-s</i>
Acc. sg.	* <i>Hr-eH-m</i>	>	* <i>HraH-m</i>	>	* <i>raH-m</i>
Gen. sg.	* <i>Hr-H-os</i>	>	* <i>Hr-H-os</i>	>	(<i>raH-os?</i>)

Beekes assumes a very early development of the Indo-Iranian */i/ anaptyxis adjacent to the laryngeal in the position **CHC*. He thinks that the root of the nominative was rebuilt on the model of the accusative thus giving **raH-is* which would be the basis for *rayí-*, though not directly, as the phonetic outcome of **raH-is* > **rais* in Vedic would be **res*. The -y- in Vedic must have been introduced from the oblique cases. The accusative **raH-m* would give *rām* and would, in his opinion, represent an archaic and isolated form (along with Latin *rem* which Beekes assumes to be the outcome of this paradigm, too). However, the assumption of a different ablaut grade in the accusative singular and the nominative singular does not have any basis (both forms are so-called strong forms and show the same ablaut grade in the paradigm) and additionally, as was shown by Schindler (1972: 41 with further literature there) the stem *rā-* of the root *rayí-* is itself most probably a creation of the grammarians and should rather be connected to the root *rā-* 'to give'.

If we assume the existence of the root noun *(*h_x*)*reh₁-s* in PIE, it would probably develop in Italic as follows:

	PIE	Vedic	Proto-Italic		Latin
Nom. sg.	*(<i>h_x</i>) <i>reh₁-s</i>	<i>rās</i>	* <i>rēs</i>	>	<i>rēs</i>
Gen. sg.	*(<i>h_x</i>) <i>reh₁-e/os</i>		* <i>rēs</i>	⊃	<i>reī</i> (after <i>ā</i> -stems)
Dat. sg.	*(<i>h_x</i>) <i>reh₁-eī</i>		* <i>rēī</i>	>	<i>reī</i>
Acc. sg.	*(<i>h_x</i>) <i>reh₁-m</i>	<i>rām</i>	* <i>rēm</i>	>	<i>rem</i>

The genitive singular **rēs* would have been remodeled on the basis of the *ā*-stems, i.e. the -*ī* ending was introduced into the genitive as it was done in the -*ā*-stems, where the model was the genitive in -*ī* of the -*o*-stems (cf. Weiss 2009: 222–223, 234 and 254 respectively).

6. The traditional scenario which considers the Latin word *rēs* to be an *i*-stem, together with vedic *rayi-* is somewhat more complex than the root noun scenario. It assumes the following development (cf. Meiser 1998: 147–148; Weiss 2009: 254–255):

	PIE	Vedic	Proto-Italic		Latin
Nom. sg.	*(<i>h_x</i>) <i>reh₁-i-s</i>	<i>rayís</i> (for † <i>res</i>)	* <i>reis</i>	⤵	<i>rēs</i> (after acc. * <i>rēm</i>)
Gen. sg.	*(<i>h_x</i>) <i>reh₁-i-e/os</i>	<i>rāyás</i>	* <i>rēis</i>	⤵	<i>rei</i> (after <i>ā</i> -stems)
Dat. sg.	*(<i>h_x</i>) <i>reh₁-i-ei</i>	<i>rāyé</i>	* <i>rēi</i>	>	<i>reī</i>
Acc. sg.	*(<i>h_x</i>) <i>reh₁-i-m</i>	<i>rayím</i>	* <i>rēm</i>	>	<i>rem</i>

The problematic case here is the assumption that acc. sg. *(*h_x*)*reh₁-i-m* gave Proto-Italic **rēm* (as does Meiser 1998: 148). We would expect this form to give Proto-Italic **reim* and thus Latin **rim*, just as the original nominative **reis* would have given Latin **rīs* (cf. Szemerényi 1956). Weiss (2009: 254) assumes that the form developed as follows: *(*h_x*)*reh₁-i-ṃ* > **rēi-ṃ* > **rēiem* > **rēm* > *rem*. Thus, he assumes that the final *-*m* was syllabic, following the PIE syllabification rule (cf. Schindler 1977: 56–57; Weiss 2009: 39). However, a simpler solution might also be assumed, as noted by Nussbaum (1999). According to him the Italic paradigm of **reis* could have extended the oblique stem to the accusative, a change typical of Latin consonant-stem inflection where the accusative is reinterpreted as a weak case and provided with a typical consonant-stem ending *-*ṃ* > -*em*:

	Proto-Italic		as in other consonant-stems:
Nom. sg.	* <i>reis</i>		* <i>pater</i>
Gen. sg.	* <i>rēi-e/os</i>	⤵	* <i>rēi-es</i> * <i>patr-es</i>
Dat. sg.	* <i>rēi-ei</i>	⤵	* <i>rēi-ei</i> * <i>patr-ei</i>
Acc. sg.	* <i>reim</i>	⤵	* <i>rēi-em</i> * <i>patr-em</i>

At the next step the accusative singular **rēi-em* would have developed into **rē.em* and consequently into **rēm*. This **rēm* was then the basis for the creation of the new nominative in *rēs* before the shortening of vowels in front of /m/.

It seems then that this word was the first to create the so-called *ē*-stems in Italic. It is also present in Sabellic, most notably in the Umbrian forms dat.sg. *ri*, abl. sg. *ri* and abl.sg. *re(per)*, which have the same origin as the Latin forms, cf. Untermann (2000: 635). The analogical remodeling in *diēs*, i.e. the formation of the nominative **diēs* beside the accusative in **diēm* could have been an independent development or could have been based on the model of **rēm* :: **rēs* proportion. It is worth noting that the remodeling must have taken place before the shortening of vowels in front of /m/ since otherwise forms such as *opem*, *noctem*, *pedem* should have also developed a nominative in **opēs*, **noctēs* and **pedēs* (cf. Nussbaum 1999). The same process has probably occurred in the other core fifth declension forms: *spēs*, *fidēs*, *plēbēs* which are discussed below.

7. The three other common words belonging to the fifth declension are: *spēs* 'hope', *fidēs* 'faith' and *plēbēs* 'people'. They are usually thought of as stemming from the proto-language **speh_x*- (**h₁* or **h₂*), **b^hid^h-ej* and **pleh₁-d^hu-es* respectively (cf. Meiser 1998: 148–149; de Vaan 2008: 218–219, 471, 580 for all the mentioned forms respectively). However, it is far from certain that any of those words actually comes from the exact proto-forms mentioned above. Additionally, Vine (2013) has noted that *famēs* 'hunger' could also secondarily belong to this type of inflection.

8. *Spēs*, meaning 'hope', does not fit well with its presumed cognates among the other Indo-European languages, most notably because of the isolated meaning: Ved. *sphirá*- 'fat', Lith. *spėti* 'to be in time, be capable', OCS *spěti* 'to succeed'. OE *spōwan* 'to prosper' (cf. de Vaan 2008: 580; WH 2: 573–574; EM: 1132). Meiser (1998: 149) explains the origin of this word as a combination of a root noun **sp^heh₁-s* and an *s*-stem **sp^heh₁-es* but the assumption of the original *s*-stem is rightly criticized by Schrijver (1991: 380) in view of the existence of other *s*-stems in Latin which were preserved as such. De Vaan (2008: 580) reconstructs the root as **speh₁*- following the assumption that **h₁*, along with **h₂* caused aspiration in Indo-Iranian in the **-THV*- context but this view is not accepted universally (cf. Mayrhofer 1986: 136–137). He also assumes that the Old English form *spōwan* comes from the same root and I suspect that he wants to explain it from a different ablaut grade, though he does not mention this problem at all.

The problem of the etymology of this word is thoroughly discussed by Nussbaum (2010). He notes that the word occurs in the singular in all the cases and in the plural but only in the nominative and in the accusative and that there is

no genitive, dative or ablative plural (a fact already noted by Cicero, cf. *Topica* 30). There is a rare word *spērēs* attested four times in Archaic Latin and the verb *spērāre*. Nussbaum (2010), taking into account the comparative evidence, reconstructs **spēh₂-* instead of **spēh₁-* which he sees as problematic because of the Germanic **spō(j)a* with an unexpected *o*-grade (**spoh₁-i*) and the aspiration in Vedic *spīrā-*. He explains the origin of *spēs* starting from the semantics, with the observation that ‘hope’ can be the result of a desiderative **-s* formation ‘to wish for a successful outcome’. Such formations are replaced in Latin with *sā*-presents. Then the desiderative **spēh₂-s* would be replaced by **spēsā-* (giving *spērāre*). Due to its aberrant semantics, *spēs* may then well be originally an underlying verbal abstract of *spērāre* (so Nussbaum 2010).

9. *Fidēs* is usually reconstructed as an *i*-stem (perhaps hysterokinetic but then it might also be an internal derivative of another primary formation), cf. de Vaan (2008: 219), WH (1: 494), EM (415–416). The solution given by Meillet (1922: 215–218), that this word was modeled on PIE **kred-d^heh₁*, ‘trust’, followed by Schrijver (1991: 380), is rightly criticized by de Vaan (2008: 219). De Vaan himself reconstructs the **-eh₁* suffix for the Latin form which does not have any comparative evidence. However, if the connection with Greek *peithō* ‘persuasion’ is correct, then the Latin form reflects the form **b^hid^h-ej-* with the full grade generalized throughout the paradigm as Proto-Italic **φιδεj*. The accusative would then be **φιδεj-em* > **φιδεem* > **φιδēm* and to this form a new nominative in **φιδēs* was made (cf. the creation of *diēs*) giving the Latin form *fidēs* (cf. Nussbaum 1999).

10. *Plēbēs* is usually reconstructed² as an hysterokinetic **-ueh₂-* stem – Steinbauer (apud Mayrhofer 1986: 113) reconstructs it as an **-ueh₂-* stem while Schrijver favours the hysterodynamic **-ueh₁-* stem (Schrijver 1991: 381). Both solutions seem flawed to me as the reconstructions are more transponats than actual proto-forms as the evidence for a suffix of the **-ueh₂-* or **-ueh₁-* shape in the proto-language is scarce, at most. Klingenschmitt (1992: 127) assumes that this word goes back to a hysterokinetic **-u*-stem but the assumption that its vocalism (**pl^hh₁d^h-u-* > **plāp-u*) was influenced by *plēnus* ‘full’ (cf. Meiser 1998: 149) seems improbable. It seems far more likely to me that this word actually goes back to an **u*-stem **pleh₁d^h-u-* *s* which had the form **pleh₁d^h-u-e/os* in the oblique and this in turn gave Latin *plēbis* to which both *plēbs*, *-is* and *plēbēs*, *-ēi* were made as nominatives. The vocalism

2 For the earlier theories see WH (2: 320–321), EM (909–910).

of *plēbēs* could have been influenced by *pūbēs* (cf. Muller 1926: 344, 350–351; Ernout 1954: 109)³, a word of similar usage and meaning in the archaic formula *pube praesenti*, attested in Plautus.⁴ There seemed to be a competition between the three words concerning the public: *pūbēs*, *populus* and *poplicus* so this kind of influence of one form on the other is not surprising (as in *pūblicus* itself which seems to be a contamination of *pubēs* and archaic *poplicus*, cf. Muller 1926: 350; de Vaan 2008: 495). The Greek form *plēt^hūs* might also come from the same oblique form with remade nominative on analogy to the forms which contained a laryngeal, e.g. *op^hrūs* ‘eyebrow’ < **h₃b^hruh_x*- (cf. de Lamberterie 1990: 636–640; Klingenschmitt 1992: 127; Martínez García 1996: 224–233; Nussbaum 1998: 533–534; Neri 2003: 110–112).

11. Alongside those core forms we also find numerous abstract nouns in *-iēs* of the type: *aciēs* ‘sharpness’, *rabiēs* ‘rage’ and also abstract nouns in *-iēs/-ia* (*māteriēs* ‘matter, wood’, *mūriēs* ‘brine, pickle’) and *-itiēs* (*nōtitiēs* ‘acquaintance’, *segnitiēs* ‘sloth, inertia’) which have alternating forms of the first declension (ie. respectively *māteria*, *mūria* and *nōtitia*, *segnitia*). The most startling fact about those formations is that they are already present in archaic Latin and are used synonymously. Already in Cato’s ‘De Agri Cultura’ we encounter e.g. *muriēs* (nom. sg.) and *muriam* (acc. sg. of *muria*) or *māteriem* (acc. sg. to *māteriēs*) and *māteriam* (acc. sg. to *māteria*) used side by side.⁵ Among the *māteriēs/-ia*-type nouns we can discern between those in which both variants appear in the same period (as *māteriēs* [Cato], *māteria* [Cato]), those in which the *-iēs* variant is attested first and the *-ia* variant is later (like *illuiiēs* [Terence] and *illuua* [Late Latin]) and those in which it is the *-ia* variant that is attested earlier whereas the *-iēs* form develops later (e.g. *effigia* [Plautus] and *effigiēs* [Cicero]). Most of those formations seem either to be deverbal (*seriēs*, *speciēs*, *effigiēs*) or denominal abstract nouns (*māteriēs*, *luxuriēs*, cf. Mikkola 1964: 168) but several of those have a completely opaque form in terms of their derivational history within the Latin material (*ingluviēs*, *saniēs*).⁶

3 The origin of Latin *pūbēs*, *-is* is also a matter of dispute, cf. most recently Garnier (2010), earlier Adams (1985).

4 Plautus, Pseudolus 126: “pube praesenti in contione, omni poplo” (cf. Muller 1926: 350).

5 If not stated otherwise, the attestations of the forms and citations are taken from *Bibliotheca Teubneriana Latina* (2002).

6 On the origin of those formations see Piwowarczyk 2016.

12. It has been claimed that two words *diēs* and *rēs* could not form the basis for the creation of a completely new type of inflection (Schrijver 1991: 366ff. following Pedersen 1926). However, if one checks the frequency dictionary for Latin it becomes clear that those two words belong to the most frequently used in the language – with 1,458 and 2,735 occurrences for *diēs* and *rēs* respectively (Delatte et al. 1981: 28, 92). Therefore, this should not be taken as an argument against the secondary nature of the Latin fifth declension.

13. Whereas the precise mechanism and the relative chronology of the formation of all the reflexes of the Proto-Indo-European stems in Italic are not totally uncovered, what seems quite clear is the fact that the nominative in **dijēs* was extended to the accusative as **dijēm* on the model of **rēs* :: **rēm* and thus gave rise to the existence of the so-called fifth declension.

Bibliography

Primary sources

Bibliotheca Teubneriana Latina (BTL-2). 2002. K.G. Saur Verlag GmbH, Brepols Publishers, CETEDOC, CTLO, IHS Technologies. München–Leipzig.

Secondary sources

- Adams D.Q. 1985. Sanskrit *pūmān*, Latin *pūbēs* and related words. – *Die Sprache* 31: 1–16.
- Beekes R.S.P. 1985. *The Origins of the Indo-European Nominal Inflexion*. Innsbruck.
- Brereton J., Jamison S. 2014. *The Rigveda. The earliest religious poetry of India*. [vol. 1–3]. Oxford.
- Brugmann K. 1886. *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Strassburg.
- Buck C. 1904. *A Grammar of Oscan and Umbrian*. Boston.
- Delatte L., Evrard Et., Govaerts S., Denooz J. 1981. *Dictionnaire fréquentiel et Index inverse de la langue latine*. Liège.
- EM = Ernout A., Meillet A. 1951. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine*. Paris.
- Ernout A. 1954. *Aspects du vocabulaire latin*. Paris.
- Fortson B.W. 2010. *Indo-European Language and Culture. An Introduction*. [2nd edition]. Malden (MA), Oxford, Carlton.
- Garnier R. 2010. Tum mihi prima genās: Phraséologie et étymologie du Latin *pūbēs*. – *Historische Sprachforschung* 123: 181–211.
- Geldner K. 1951. *Der Rig-Veda, aus dem Sanskrit ins Deutsche übersetzt, und mit einem laufenden Kommentar versehen*. Cambridge (MA).

- Griffith R.T.H. 1897. *The Hymns of the Rigveda*. [vol. 2; 2nd edition]. Benares.
- Klingenschmitt G. 1992. Die lateinische Nominalflexion. – Panagl O., Krisch Th. (eds.). *Latein und Indogermanisch*. Innsbruck: 89–135.
- Kortlandt F. 1997. Baltic *ē-* and *ijā-* stems. – *Baltistica* 32: 157–163.
- Lamberterie Ch. de. 1990. *Les adjectifs grecs en -υς*. Louvain-la-Neuve.
- Leumann M. 1977. *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre*. München.
- Martinez Garcia F.J. 1996. *Los nombres en -u del griego*. Frankfurt am Main.
- Mayrhofer M. 1963. *Kurzgefaßtes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen. Band II*. Heidelberg.
- Mayrhofer M. 1976. *Kurzgefaßtes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen. Band III*. Heidelberg.
- Mayrhofer M. 1986. *Indogermanische Grammatik I.2.: Lautlehre*. Heidelberg.
- Meillet A. 1922. Lat. *crēdō* et *fidēs*. – *Mémoires de la Société de linguistique de Paris* 22: 215–218.
- Meiser G. 1998. *Historische Laut- und Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache*. Darmstadt.
- Mikkola E. 1964. *Die Abstraktion im Lateinischen. Erster Teil*. Helsinki.
- Muller F. 1926. *Altitalisches Wörterbuch*. Göttingen.
- Neri S. 2003. *I sostantivi in -u del gotico. Morfologia e preistoria*. Innsbruck.
- Nussbaum A.J. 1998. Severe Problems. – Jasanoff J., Melchert H.C., Olivier L. (eds.). *Mir Curad. Studies in Honor of Calvert Watkins*. Innsbruck.
- Nussbaum A.J. 1999. What's new with *diēu*. [Paper presented at Harvard University].
- Nussbaum A.J. 2010. A Nominal Contribution: *spēs* exploration. [Paper presented at the LMU Munich in May 2010].
- Pedersen H. 1926. *La cinquième déclinaison latine*. Copenhagen.
- Piowarczyk D.R. 2016. The origin of the Latin *-iēs/-ia* inflection. – *Historische Sprachforschung* 129: 108–123.
- Rau J. 2010. The derivational history of PIE *diēu-/diu-* '(god of the) day-lit sky; day'. – Ronald K., Oettinger N., Rieken E., Weiss M. (eds.). *Ex Anatolia lux. Anatolian and Indo-European studies in honor of H. Craig Melchert on the occasion of his sixty-fifth birthday*. Ann Arbor.
- Saussure F. de. 1879. *Mémoire sur le système primitif des voyelles dans les langues indo-européennes*. Leipsick.
- Schindler J. 1972. *Das Wurzelnomen im Arischen und Griechischen*. [Unpublished PhD dissertation]. Würzburg.
- Schindler J. 1973. Bemerkungen zur Herkunft der idg. Diphthongstämme und zu den Eigentümlichkeiten ihrer Kasusformen. – *Die Sprache* 19: 148–157.
- Schindler J. 1977. Notizen zum Sieversschen Gesetz. – *Die Sprache* 23: 56–65.
- Schrijver P. 1991. *The Reflexes of the Proto-Indo-European Laryngeals in Latin*. Amsterdam, Atlanta.
- Sommer F. 1914. *Die indogermanischen iā- und io-Stämme in Baltischen*. Leipzig.
- Stang Ch. 1965. Indo-européen *gwōm, *d(i)jēm. – Heinz A. et al. (eds.). *Symbolae Linguae in honorem Georgii Kurylowicz*. Kraków: 292–296.

- Szemerényi O. 1956. Latin *rēs* and the Indo-European long-diphthong stem nouns. – *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung* 73: 167–202.
- Untermann J. 2000. *Wörterbuch des Oskisch-Umbrischen*. Heidelberg.
- Vaan M. de. 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the other Italic languages*. Leiden.
- Vine B. 2013. Taking the Fifth: Latin *famēs* “hunger” and the Fifth Declension. [Handout of a paper delivered at the 144th Annual Meeting of the American Philological Association in Seattle on January 6, 2013].
- Watkins C. 1974. God. – Mayrhofer M., Meid W., Schlerath B., Schmidt R. (eds.). *Antiquitates indogermanicae. Gedenkschrift für Hermann Güntert*. Innsbruck: 101–110.
- Weiss M. 2009. *Outline of the Historical and Comparative Grammar of Latin*. Ann Arbor.
- WH = Walde A., Hoffmann J. 1938–1954. *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. [3rd edition; 2 vols.]. Heidelberg.

